# Beating the PNS attack in practical quantum cryptography

Xiang-Bin Wang

IMAI Quantum Computation and Information Project,

ERATO, JST, Daini Hongo White Bldg. 201,

5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 133-0033, Japan

arXiv:quant-ph/0410075v5 24 Jan 2005

## Abstract

In practical quantum key distribution, weak coherent state is often used and the channel transmittance can be very small therefore the protocol could be totally insecure under the photon-number-splitting attack. We propose an efficient method to verify the upper bound of the fraction of counts caused by multi-photon pluses transmitted from Alice to Bob, given whatever type of Eve's action. The protocol simply uses two coherent states for the signal pulses and vacuum for decoy pulse. Our verified upper bound is sufficiently tight for QKD with very lossy channel, in both asymptotic case and non-asymptotic case. The coherent states with mean photon number from 0.2 to 0.5 can be used in practical quantum cryptography. We show that so far our protocol is the *only* decoy-state protocol that really works for currently existing set-ups.

Unlike the classical cryptography, quantum key distribution(QKD)[1, 2, 3] can help two remote parties to set up the secure key by non-cloning theorem[4]. Further, proofs for the unconditional security over noisy channel have been given[5, 6, 7, 8]. The security of practical QKD with weak coherent states has also been shown[9, 11]. However there are still some limitations for QKD in practice, especially over long distance. In particular, large loss of channel seems to be the main challenge to the long-distance QKD with weak coherent states. A dephased coherent state $|\mu e^{i\theta}\rangle$ is actually a mixed state of

$$\rho_u = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} |\mu e^{i\theta}\rangle\langle\mu e^{i\theta}| \mathrm{d}\theta = \sum_n P_n(\mu)|n\rangle\langle n| \tag{1}$$

and $P_n(\mu) = \frac{\mu^n e^{-\mu}}{n!}$. Here $\mu$ is a non-negative number. In practice, especially in doing long-distance QKD, the channel transmittance $\eta$ can be rather small. If $\eta < (1 - e^{-\mu} - \mu e^{-\mu})/\mu$, Eavesdropper (Eve) in principle can have the full information of Bob's sifted key by the photon-number-splitting (PNS) attack[10]: Eve blocks all single-photon pulses and part of multi-photon pulses and separates each of the remained multi-photon pulses into two parts therefore each part contains at least one photon. She keeps one part and sends the other part to Bob, through a lossless channel.

If the channel is not so lossy, Alice and Bob can still set-up the unconditionally secure final key with a key rate[11]

$$r = 1 - \Delta - H(t) - (1-\Delta)H(t/(1-\Delta)) \tag{2}$$

if we use a random classical CSS code[5] to distill the final key[11]. Here $t$ is the detected flipping error rate, $\Delta$ is the fraction of tagged signals[11], i.e. the fraction for those counts in cases when Alice sends out a multi-photon pulse. The functional $H(x) = -x\log_2 x - (1-x)\log_2(1-x)$. From the above formula we see that verifying a tight bound for $\Delta$ is the first important thing in QKD.

Originally, the PNS attack has been investigated where Alice and Bob monitor only how many non-vacuum signals arise, and how many errors happen. However, it was then shown[13] that the simple-minded method does not guarantee the final security. It is shown[13] that in a typical parameter regime nothing changes if one starts to monitor the photon number statistics as Eve can adapt her strategy to reshape the photon number distribution such that it becomes Poissonian again. A very important method with decoy states was then proposed by Hwang[14], where the *unconditional* verification of the

multi-photon counting rate is given. Hwang's decoy-state method can faithfully estimate the upper bound of $\Delta$ through decoy-pulses, given *whatever* type of PNS attack. (Remark: Decoy-state method is not the only solution to the issue. An alternative method is to use strong refenence light[12].) However, Hwang's initial protocol[14] does not give a sufficiently tight bound. For example, in the case of $\mu = 0.3$, by Hwang's method, the the optimized verified upper bound of $\Delta$ is 60.4%. As it has been mentioned[14, 15], decoy-state method can be combined with GLLP[11] to distill unconditionally secure final key. With the value $\Delta = 60.4\%$, by eq(2), the key rate can be rather low in practice. Following Hwang's work[14], decoy-state method was then studied by Lo and co-workers [15, 16]. They proposed their main protocol : Try EVERY Poisson distribution of mixed states in Fock space, i.e., to test the counting rates of coherent states $\{|\mu' e^{i\theta}\rangle\}$ with ALL possible values of $\mu'$ in one protocol. In such a way the counting rates of each state $|n\rangle\langle n|$ can be calculated therefore an exact value of $\Delta$ can be given. However, such a protocol seems to be inefficient in practice, because it requires infinite number of classes of different coherent states to work as the decoy states. Prior to this, an idea of using vacuum to test the dark count and using *very* weak coherent state as decoy state to verify the lower bound of single-photon transmittance had been shortly stated[16]. However, as it is shown in the Appendix, given a very lossy channel, the number of single-photon counts of all those decoy states is much less than the dark count. Even a *little bit* fluctuation of dark count can totally destroy any meaningful estimation of single-photon counts. To make a meaningful estimation, the statistical fluctuation of dark count must be pretty small and this requires an unreasonablly large number of decoy-pulses which request more than 14 days to produce. In summary, **so far no prior art result of decoy-state can really work in practice.**

Here, we propose a new decoy-state protocol which is the *only* one that really works for currently existing set-ups. The protocol uses only 3 different states and the verified bound values are sufficiently tight for long-distance QKD. In the protocol, coherent states with average photon number $\mu$, $\mu'$ are used for signal pulses and vacuum is used for the decoy pulse. Since both $\mu$ and $\mu'$ are in a reasonable range, pulses produced in both states can be used to distill the final key. That is to say, both of them can be regarded as the *signal* states. Our result *uniquely* shows that long-distance QKD with decoy states by a *real-world* protocol is possible, with a reasonable number of total pulses.

For simplicity, we denote those pulses produced in state $|\mu e^{i\theta}\rangle, |\mu' e^{i\theta}\rangle, |0\rangle$ as class $Y_\mu, Y_{\mu'}$

and $Y_0$, respectively. In the protocol $\theta$ is randomized. Also, Alice mixes the positions of all pulses therefore no one but Alice knows which pulse belongs to which class in the protocol. They observe the counting rates of each classes and then verify the upper bounds of counts caused by multi-photon pulses from class $Y_\mu, Y_{\mu'}$, respectively. If these values are too large, they abandon the protocol, otherwise they go on to do key distillations using pulses from each class of $Y_\mu$ *and* $Y_{\mu'}$ by GLLP[11].

We first define the *counting rate* of *any* state $\rho$: the probability that Bob's detector clicks whenever a state $\rho$ is *sent out* by Alice. We *disregard* what state Bob may receive here. This *counting rate* is called as the *yield* in other literatures[14, 15]. We denote the counting rate (yield) of vacuum, class $Y_0, Y_\mu, Y_{\mu'}$ by notations $s_0, S_\mu, S_{\mu'}$, respectively. These 3 parameters are observed in the protocol itself: After all pulses are sent out, Bob announces which pulse has caused a click which pulse has not caused a click. Since Alice knows which pulse belongs to which class, Alice can calculate the *counting rates* of each classes of pulses. Therefore we shall regard $s_0, S_\mu, S_{\mu'}$ as known parameters in protocol. The value $s_0$ is counting rate at Bob's side when Alice sends vacuum pulses. We shall also call $s_0$ as the vacuum count or dark count rate.

Their task is to verify the upper bound of $\Delta$, the fraction of multi-photon counts among all counts caused by pulses in class $Y_\mu$ and also the upper bound of $\Delta'$, the fraction of multi-photon counts among all counts caused by pulses in class $Y_{\mu'}$. We shall show how they can deduce the upper values of $\Delta, \Delta'$ from the values of $\{s_0, S_\mu, S_{\mu'}\}$. We shall focus on $\Delta$ first and latter obtain $\Delta'$ based on the knowledge of $\Delta$.

For convenience, we *always* assume

$$\mu' > \mu; \mu' e^{-\mu'} > \mu e^{-\mu} \tag{3}$$

in this paper. A dephased coherent state $|\mu e^{i\theta}\rangle$ has the following convex form:

$$\rho_\mu = e^{-\mu}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \mu e^{-\mu}|1\rangle\langle 1| + c\rho_c \tag{4}$$

and $c = 1 - e^{-\mu} - \mu e^{-\mu} > 0$,

$$\rho_c = \frac{1}{c}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} P_n(\mu)|n\rangle\langle n|. \tag{5}$$

Similarly, state $|\mu' e^{i\theta}\rangle$ after dephasing is

$$\rho_{\mu'} = e^{-\mu'}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \mu' e^{-\mu'}|1\rangle\langle 1| + c\frac{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}}{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}}\rho_c + d\rho_d \tag{6}$$

and $d = 1 - e^{-\mu'} - \mu' e^{-\mu'} - c\frac{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}}{u^2 e^{-\mu}} \geq 0$. $\rho_d$ is a density operator. (We shall only use the fact that $d$ is non-negative and $\rho_d$ *is* a density operator.) In deriving the above convex form, we have used the fact $P_n(\mu')/P_2(\mu') > P_n(\mu)/P_2(\mu)$ for all $n > 2$, given the conditions of eq.(3). With these convex forms of density operators, it is equivalent to say that Alice sometimes sends nothing ($|0\rangle\langle 0|$), sometimes sends $|1\rangle\langle 1|$, sometimes sends $\rho_c$ and sometimes sends $\rho_d$, though Alice does not know which time she has sent out which one of these states. In each individual sending, she only knows which class the pulse belongs to. We shall use notations $s_0, s_1, s_c, S_\mu, S_{\mu'}, s_d$ for the *counting rates* of state $|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|, \rho_c, \rho_\mu, \rho_{\mu'}, \rho_d$, respectively. Given any state $\rho$, nobody but Alice can tell whether it is from class $Y_\mu$ or $Y_{\mu'}$. Asymptotically, we have

$$s_\rho(\mu) = s_\rho(\mu') \tag{7}$$

and $s_\rho(\mu), s_\rho(\mu')$ are *counting rates* for state $\rho$ from class $Y_\mu$ and class $Y_{\mu'}$, respectively.

We shall use the safest assumption that Eve also controls the the detection efficiency and dark count of Bob's detector. We only consider the overall transmittance including the channel, Bob's devices and detection efficiency. By eq.(4), we relate $\Delta$ with parameter $s_c$, the multi-photon counting rate in class $Y_\mu$ by:

$$\Delta = c\frac{s_c}{S_\mu}. \tag{8}$$

To verify the upper bound of $\Delta$ for pulses from class $Y_\mu$, we only need to verify the upper bound of $s_c$, the *counting rate* of mixed state $\rho_c$. The task is reduced to formulating $s_c$ by $\{s_0, S_\mu, S_{\mu'}\}$, which are measured directly in the protocol itself. The coherent state $\rho_{\mu'}$ is convexed by $\rho_c$ and other states. Given the condition of eq.(3), the probability of $\rho_c$ in state $\rho_{\mu'}$ is larger than that in $\rho_\mu$. Using this fact we can make a preliminary estimation of $s_c$. From eq.(6) we immediately obtain

$$S_{\mu'} = e^{-\mu'} s_0 + \mu' e^{-\mu'} s_1 + c\frac{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}}{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}} s_c + d s_d. \tag{9}$$

$s_0$ is known, $s_1$ and $s_d$ are unknown, but they are never less than 0. Therefore we have

$$c s_c \leq \frac{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}} \left( S_{\mu'} - e^{-\mu'} s_0 - \mu' e^{-\mu'} s_1 \right). \tag{10}$$

We can obtain Hwang's main result[14] by

$$c s_c \leq \frac{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}} \left( S_{\mu'} - e^{-\mu'} s_0 \right) \leq \frac{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}} S_{\mu'} \tag{11}$$

Combining this equation with eq.(8)we have

$$\Delta \leq \frac{\mu^2 e^{-\mu} S_{\mu'}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'} S_\mu}. \tag{12}$$

This is just eq.(12) in ref.[14]. In the normal case that there is no Eve's attack, Alice and Bob will find $S_{\mu'}/S_\mu = \frac{1-e^{-\eta\mu'}}{1-e^{-\eta\mu}} = \mu'/\mu$ in there protocol therefore they they can verify $\Delta \leq \frac{\mu e^{-\mu}}{\mu' e^{-\mu'}}$, which is just eq.(13) of Hwang's work[14]. Our derivation looks significantly simpler than that in ref.[14].

Having obtained the crude results above, we now show that the verification can be done more sophisticatedly and one can further tighten the bound significantly. In the inequality (11), we have dropped terms $s_1$ and $s_d$, since we only have trivial knowledge about $s_1$ and $s_d$ there, i.e., $s_1 \geq 0$ and $s_d \geq 0$. Therefore, inequality(10) has no advantage at that moment. However, after we have obtained the crude upper bound of $s_c$, we can have a larger-than-0 lower bound for $s_1$, provided that our crude upper bound for $\Delta$ given by eq.(11) is not too large. From eq.(4) we have

$$e^{-\mu} s_0 + \mu e^{-\mu} s_1 + c s_c = S_\mu. \tag{13}$$

With the crude upper bound for $s_c$ given by eq.(11), we have the non-trivial lower bound for $s_1$ now:

$$s_1 \geq S_\mu - e^{-\mu} s_0 - c s_c > 0. \tag{14}$$

The updated $s_1$ will in return further tighten the upper bound of $s_c$ by eq.(10), and the tightened $s_c$ will again update $s_1$ by eq.(14) and so on. After many iterations, the final values for $s_c$ and $s_1$ are given by the simultaneous constraints of of inequalities (14) and (10). We have the following final bound after solving them:

$$\Delta \leq \frac{\mu}{\mu' - \mu} \left( \frac{\mu e^{-\mu} S_{\mu'}}{\mu' e^{-\mu'} S_\mu} - 1 \right) + \frac{\mu e^{-\mu} s_0}{\mu' S_\mu}. \tag{15}$$

Here we have used eq.(8). In the case of $s_0 << \eta$, if there is no Eve., $S'_\mu/S_\mu = \mu'/\mu$. Alice and Bob must be able to verify

$$\Delta = \left. \frac{\mu \left( e^{\mu'-\mu} - 1 \right)}{\mu' - \mu} \right|_{\mu'-\mu \to 0} = \mu \tag{16}$$

in the protocol. This is close to the real value of fraction of multi-photon counts: $1 - e^{-\mu}$, given that $\eta << 1$. This shows that eq.(15) indeed gives a rather tight upper bound. In our

derivation, all multi-photon counts from pulses in class $Y_\mu$ are due to only *one* mixed state, $\rho_c$. Therefore we only need to calculate *one* unknown parameter, $s_c$. However, in Ref[15], they have considered the contribution of each Fock state and there are infinite number of unknown variables of $\{s_n\}$. Therefore they need $infinite$ number of different coherent states in their main protocol[15] while we only need three.

With the upper bound of $s_c$ (or, $\Delta$), pulses from class $Y_\mu$ can be used for key distillation by GLLP[11]. On the other hand, given $s_c$, we can calculate the lower bound of $s_1$ through eq.(14). Given $s_1$, we can also calculate the upper bound of $\Delta'$, the fraction of multi-photon count among all counts caused by pulses from class $Y_{\mu'}$. Explicitly,

$$\Delta' \leq 1 - (1 - \Delta - \frac{e^{-\mu} s_0}{S_\mu}) e^{\mu - \mu'} - \frac{e^{-\mu'} s_0}{S_{\mu'}}. \tag{17}$$

The values of $\mu, \mu'$ should be chosen in a reasonable range, e.g., from 0.2 to 0.5. To maximize the key rate, one need to consider the quantities of transmittance, quantum bit error rate(QBER) and vacuum counts jointly. The optimization is not studied in this paper.

The results above are only for the asymptotic case. In practice, there are statistical fluctuations, i.e., Eve. has non-negligibly small probability to treat the pulses from different classes a little bit differently, even though the pulses have the same state. It is *insecure* if we simply use the asymptotic result in practice. Our task remained is to verify a tight upper bound of $\Delta$ and the probability that the real value of $\Delta$ breaks the verified upper bound is exponentially close to 0.

The counting rate of any state $\rho$ in class $Y_{\mu'}$ now can be slightly different from the counting rate of the same state $\rho$ from another class, $Y_\mu$, with non-negligible probability. We shall use the primed notation for the counting rate for any state in class $Y_{\mu'}$ and the original notation for the counting rate for any state in class $Y_\mu$. Explicitly, eq.(13,10) are now converted to

$$\begin{cases} e^{-\mu} s_0 + \mu e^{-\mu} s_1 + c s_c = S_\mu, \\ c s'_c \leq \frac{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}} \left( S_{\mu'} - \mu' e^{-\mu'} s'_1 - e^{-\mu'} s'_0 \right). \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

Setting $s'_x = (1 - r_x) s_x$ for $x = 1, c$ and $s'_0 = (1 + r_0) s_0$ we obtain

$$\mu' e^{\mu} \left[ (1 - r_c) \frac{\mu'}{\mu} - 1 \right] \Delta \leq \mu e^{\mu'} S_{\mu'} / S_\mu - \mu' e^{\mu} + [(\mu' - \mu) s_0 + r_1 s_1 + r_0 s_0] / S_\mu. \tag{19}$$

From this we can see, if $\mu$ and $\mu'$ are too close, $\Delta$ can be very large. The important question here is now whether there are reasonable values for $\mu', \mu$ so that our method has significant advantage to the previous method[14]. The answer is yes.

Given $N_1+N_2$ copies of state $\rho$, suppose the counting rate for $N_1$ randomly chosen states is $s_\rho$ and the counting rate for the remained states is $s'_\rho$, the probability that $s_\rho - s'_\rho > \delta_\rho$ is less than $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}{\delta_\rho}^2 N_0/s_\rho\right)$ and $N_0 = \mathrm{Min}(N_1, N_2)$. Now we consider the difference of counting rates for the same state from different classes, $Y_\mu$ and $Y_{\mu'}$. To make a faithful estimation for exponentially sure, we require ${\delta_\rho}^2 N_0/s_\rho = 100$. This causes a relative fluctuation

$$r_\rho = \frac{\delta_\rho}{s_\rho} \leq 10\sqrt{\frac{1}{s_\rho N_0}}. \tag{20}$$

The probability of violation is less than $e^{-25}$. To formulate the relative fluctuation $r_1, r_c$ by $s_c$ and $s_1$, we only need to check the number of pulses in $\rho_c$, $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ in each classes in the protocol. That is, using eq.(20), we can replace $r_1, r_c$ in eq.(18) by $10e^{\mu/2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu s_1 N}}$, $10\sqrt{\frac{1}{c s_c N}}$, respectively and $N$ is the number of pulses in class $Y_\mu$. Since we assume the case where vacuum-counting rate is much less than the counting rate of state $\rho_\mu$, we omit the effect of fluctuation in vacuum counting, i.e., we set $r_0 = 0$. With these inputs, eq.(18) can now be solved numerically. The results are listed in the following table. From this table we can see that good values of $\mu, \mu'$ indeed exist and our verified upper bounds are sufficiently tight to make QKD over very lossy channel. Note that so far this is the *only* non-asymptotic result among all existing works on decoy-state. From the table we can see that our non-asymptotic values are less than Hwang′s asymptotic values already. Our verified values are rather close to the true values. We have assumed the vacuum count rate $s_0 = 10^{-6}$ in the calculation. If $s_0$ is smaller, our results will be even better. Actually, the value of $s_0$ (dark count) can be even lower than the assumed value here[17, 18]. In the real set-up given by Gobby et al[17], the light loses a half over every 15km, the devices and detection loss is 4.5% and $s_0 \leq 8.5 \times 10^{-7}$. Given these parameters, we believe that our protocol works over a distance longer than 120km with with $\mu = 0.3, \mu' = 0.45$ and *a reasonable number* of total pulses.

In conclusion, following the work by Hwang[14], we have proposed an efficient and feasible decoy-state method to do QKD over very lossy channel. The main protocol in Ref.[15] is impractical because it depends on infinite number of pulses. The idea stated in Ref[16] doesn't work in practice either because it has implicitly assumed an unreasonablly large numbe of pulses which require more than 14 days to produce, by the currently existing technology. Our protocol is the *only* decoy-state protocol which really works with currently existing set-ups. The method of this paper can be further developed[19].

*Note added:* After the earlier versions of this work (quant-ph/0410075) had been

TABLE I: The verified upper bound of the fraction of tagged pulses in QKD. $\Delta_H$ is the result from Hwang's method. $\Delta_R$ is the true value of the fraction of multi-photon counts in case there is no Eve. $\Delta_H$ and $\Delta_R$ do not change with channel transmittance. $\Delta_{W1}$ is bound for pulses in class $Y_\mu$, given that $\eta = 10^{-3}$. $\Delta_{W2}$ and $\Delta'_{W2}$ are bound values for the pulses in class $Y_\mu, Y_{\mu'}$ respectively, given that $\eta = 10^{-4}$. We assume $s_0 = 10^{-6}$. The number of pulses is $10^{10}$ in class $Y_\mu, Y'_\mu$ in calculating $\Delta_{W1}$ and $8 \times 10^{10}$ in calculating $\Delta_{W2}, \Delta'_{W2}$. $4 \times 10^9$ vacuum pulses is sufficient for class $Y_0$. The bound values will change by less than 0.01 if the value of $s_0$ is 1.5 times larger. The numbers inside brackets are chosen values for $\mu'$. For example, in the column of $\mu = 0.25$, data 30.9%(0.41) means, if we choose $\mu = 0.25, \mu' = 0.41$, we can verify $\Delta \leq 30.9\%$ for class $Y_\mu$.

| $\mu$ | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.35 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\Delta_H$ | 44.5% | 52.9% | 60.4% | 67.0% |
| $\Delta_R$ | 18.3% | 22.2% | 25.9% | 29.5% |
| $\Delta_{W1}$ | 23.4%(0.34) | 28.9%(0.38) | 34.4%(0.43) | 39.9%(0.45) |
| $\Delta_{W2}$ | 25.6%(0.39) | 30.9%(0.41) | 36.2%(0.45 ) | 41.5%(0.47) |

| $\mu'$ | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.45 | 0.47 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\Delta_H$ | 71.8% | 74.0% | 78.0% | 79.8% |
| $\Delta_R$ | 32.3% | 33.7% | 36.2% | 37.5% |
| $\Delta'_{W2}$ | 40.1% | 42.2% | 45.8% | 48.6 |

presente[20], H. K. Lo et al also presented their previously announced results in the arXiv (quant-ph/0411004)[21]. They claim that they have *for the first time* made the decoy-state method efficiently useful in practice. We question their claim as we have shown that none of their previously announced protocol or idea really works in practice. If, in Ref[21], their claim is actually based on something different from their previously announced results, since Ref[21] itself is presented later than our work[20], then at least the phrase "for the first time" is inappropriate in their claim. To my understanding, Ref[21] itself does not contain anything new, it is an extended version of their previously announced results. Therefore, not only the phrase "for the first time" in their claim is inappropriate, but also their whole claim is inappropriate.

**Appendix:**

In this Appendix, we give detailed demonstration that the shortly stated idea in Ref[16] actually doesn't work. It is stated[16]:"On one hand, by using a vacuum as decoy state, Alice and Bob can verify the so called dark count rates of their detectors. On the other

hand, by using a very weak coherent pulse as decoy state, Alice and Bob can easily lower bound the yield (channel transmittance) of single-photon pulses." This is to say, there are two sets of decoy pulses: Set $Y_0$ contains $M$ vacuum pulses $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ and set $Y_v$ contains $N$ pulses of very weak coherent state $|\mu_v\rangle\langle\mu_v|$. They can only observe the total counts of set $Y_0$ and the total counts of set $Y_v$. By that idea[16], to verify a meaningful lower bound of $s_1$, the value $\mu_v$ must be less than channel transmittance $\eta$. For clarity, we assume zero dark count first. They can only observe the total counts of pulses in set $Y_v$. In the normal case when there is no Eve, $N$ decoy pulses in class $Y_v$ will cause $N(1-e^{-\eta\mu_v})$ counts. For the security, one has no other choice but to assume the worst case that all multi-photon pulses have caused a count. Therefore the lower bound of single-photon counts is $N[1-e^{-\eta\mu_v}-(1-e^{-\mu_v}-\mu_v e^{-\mu_v})] = N(\eta\mu_v-\mu_v^2/2)$. The lower bound value for $s_1$ is verified by $s_1 \geq \frac{N(\eta\mu_v-\mu_v^2/2)}{N\mu_v e^{-\mu_v}} \approx \eta-\mu_v/2$. Therefore one has to request $\mu_v \leq \eta$ here if one wants to verify $s_1 \geq \eta/2$. Now we consider the effect caused by dark counts. Suppose, after observed the counts of pulses in set $Y_0$, they find that the dark count rate, $s_0 = 10^{-6}$ for set $Y_0$. Note that the dark count rate for set $Y_0$ and the dark count rate for set $Y_v$ can be a little bit different due to the stastical fluctuation. Given $N$ pulses of state $|\mu_v\rangle$, there are $Ne^{-\mu_v}$ vacuum pulses and $N(1-e^{-\mu_v})$ non-vacuum pulses. Alice does not know which pulse is vacuum which pulse is non-vacuum. They can *only* observe the number of total counts ($n_t$) caused by $N$ decoy pulses in set $Y_v$, which is the summation of dark counts, $n_0$, the number of single-photon counts $n_1$ and the number of multi-photon counts, $n_m$, of those $N$ decoy pulses in set $Y_v$. After observed the number of total counts $n_t$, they try to estimates $n_1$ by the formula $n_t = n_0+n_1+n_m$, with $n_0 = Ns_0'e^{-\mu_v}$ and the worst-case assumption of $n_m = N(1-e^{-\mu_v}-\mu_v e^{-\mu_v})$. The value $s_0'$ is the dark count rate for set $Y_v$ and the value $s_0'$ is never known *exactly*. They only know the approximate value, $s_0' \approx s_0 = 10^{-6}$. Consider the case $\eta = 10^{-4}$. The expected value of $n_1+n_m$ is $N(1-e^{-\eta\mu}) \leq 10^{-8}N$. Meanwhile, the expected number of dark counts is around $10^{-6}N$. Since the expected number of dark counts there is much larger than the expected number of $n_1+n_m$, *a little bit* fluctuation of dark counts will totally destroy the estimation of the value $n_1+n_m$ therefore totally destroy the estimation of $n_1$. To make a faithful estimation, we request the fluctuation of dark count to be much less than $10^{-8}N$, e.g., in the magnitude order of $10^{-9}N$. This is to say, one must make sure that the relative fluctuation of dark counts is less than 0.1%, with a probability *exponentially* close to 1 (say, $1-e^{-25}$). This requires $N$ larger than $10^{14}$. The

system repetition rate is normally less than $8 \times 10^7$ in practice. Producing $10^{14}$ decoy pulses needs more than 14 days.

**Acknowledgments**

I am grateful to Prof. H. Imai for his long-term support. I thank Toshiyuki Shimono for his kindly help in the numerical calculation.

---

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2000.

[2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittttel, H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002), references therein.

[3] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in : Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, systems, and signal processing, Bangalore (IEEE, New York, 1984) p.175.

[4] W.K. Wootters and W.H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802 (1982).

[5] P.W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).

[6] H.-K. Lo and H.F. Chau, Science **283**, 2050 (1999).

[7] D. Mayers, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach. **48**, 351 (2001).

[8] A.K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991), C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).

[9] H. Inamori, N. Lutkenhause and D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017.

[10] G. Brassard, N. Lutkenhaus, T. Mor, and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85,1330(2000)

[11] Gottesman, H.K. Lo, N. Lutkenhause and J. Preskill, quant-ph/0212066. 418, 450(2002); J. G. Raty et al, New J. Phys. 4, 82(2002); R. J. Hughes et al, New J. Phys. 4, 43(2002).

[12] C.H. Bennett, Phys. Rev. Lett., 68, 3121(1992); M. Koashi, quant-ph/0403131.

[13] N. Lutkenhaus and M. Jahma, New J. Phys., 4, 44(2002).

[14] W.-Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 057901(2003).

[15] H.-K. Lo et al, http://www.fields.utoronto.ca/programs/scientific/04-05/quantumIC/abstracts/lo.ppt; /lo.pdf: Decoy state quantum key distribution (QKD).

[16] H.-K. Lo, p.17, Proceedings of 2004 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theor., Hune 27-July 2, 2004, Chicago.

[17] C. Gobby et al, Appl. Phys. Lett., 84, 3762(2004).

[18] H. Kosaka et al, Electron. Lett., 39, 1199(2003).

[19] X. B. Wang, quant-ph/0411047.

[20] X. B. Wang, quant-ph/0410075.

[21] H. K. Lo et al, quant-ph/0411004.